



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: 1411 M STREET, N.W., SUITE 1450
P.O. BOX 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.						
10/815,004	03/31/2004	Andrew T. Beckman	END5096.0515521	1279						
7590 01/16/2007		<table border="1"><tr><td>EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td>TOWA, RENE T</td></tr><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td></tr><tr><td>3736</td><td></td></tr></table>			EXAMINER	TOWA, RENE T	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	3736	
EXAMINER										
TOWA, RENE T										
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER									
3736										
		<table border="1"><tr><td>MAIL DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>01/16/2007</td><td>PAPER</td></tr></table>			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	01/16/2007	PAPER		
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE									
01/16/2007	PAPER									

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

H1

Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/815,004	BECKMAN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Rene Towa	3736	

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address—

THE REPLY FILED 09 January 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Upon consideration of the Applicant's argument, the Examiner notes that the claim language does not explicitly call for a "separate pusher" to drive a "cutter;" moreover, the last office action indicates that it would have been an obvious design choice to provide a separate pusher and cutter to fulfill the same purpose taught by Barsch of moving the marker for deployment. Moreover, further in the support of a design choice, it is noted that the Applicant's disclosure has failed to show that a plunger that comprises a pusher and a separate cutter provides an advantage over the prior art plungers. Furthermore, it is believed that nowhere in the claim is there a recitation of a cutter that cuts a marker; in fact, this new argument may constitute new matter. The claim language simply recites a plunger that has two parts, a pusher and a cutter, the pusher contacts the cutter to move the marker for deployment. No other limitations in the claims suggest that the cutter cuts through anything as such it is herein construed simply as another portion of the plunger that helps in the process of moving the marker for deployment.

